

# 2005-2006 SES EVALUATION REPORT

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**PROVIDER NAME:** Sylvan Learning Center (Marion, IN)

**DISTRICTS SERVED:** Marion Community Schools

**# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED:** 104

**# OF STUDENTS COMPLETED:** 94

**GRADES:** K-12

**TYPE OF DELIVERY:** Individual tutoring/small group instruction

**DESCRIPTION:** See <http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/detail-vendor2.cfm?recordID=0056>

**STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO:** 3/1

## CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 18.09%

Overall score: 3.57/4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100% (1/1)

District recommends continuation?: Y (1/1 district served)

### PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 100%

Overall Score: 3.25/4.0

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE:** **A**

## SERVICE DELIVERY

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 18.09%

Overall score: 3.44/4.0

**DISTRICT REPORT:**

% of districts reporting:	100% (1/1)
Overall score:	100% (16/16 possible points)

**PRINCIPAL REPORT:**

% of principals reporting:	100%
Overall score:	2.50/4.0

<b>ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:</b>	4.0/4.0
--------------------------------------	---------

<b>SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:</b>	<b>A-</b>
--------------------------------	-----------

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS**

<b>COMPLETION RATE:</b>	90.38%
-------------------------	--------

<b>% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS (OF THOSE WHO COMPLETED):</b>	100%
--	------

<b>TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:</b>	CAT5
---	------

<b>% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS (BASED ON 100% SAMPLE REPORTED):</b>	91.67% (Reading); 70% (Math);
---	-------------------------------

<b>AVERAGE GAIN:</b>	+1.04 (Reading); +0.59 (Math)
----------------------	-------------------------------

<b>% CHANGE IN PRE/POST ASSESSMENT:</b>	+37.25% (Reading); +16.76% (Math);
---	------------------------------------

<b>% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b>	100%
---	------

**ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):**

For each provider, the ISTEP+ scale scores for each student who participated in SES were analyzed for 2005 and 2006 in English/Language Arts and Math. Only students who completed 80% of their programs and had ISTEP+ scores for both years were included in the analysis.

<b># OF STUDENTS COMPLETING 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b>	87
(only students completing 80% of provider sessions are included in this analysis)	

## SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For the students served by Sylvan (Marion) in 2005-2006 who met the criteria described above, ISTEP+ scores grew an average of 13 points for Mathematics and 16 points for English/Language Arts. 72% showed any growth in Mathematics, and 70% showed any growth in English/Language Arts. 28% of the students showed one year's worth of growth on ISTEP+ scale score for Mathematics, compared to 48% for English/Language Arts. The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ in Mathematics declined by 3 percentage points, while the percentage passing ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts stayed the same from 2005 to 2006.

**# OF STUDENTS:** 39 (Math); 40 (E/LA)

(of students completing 80% of the sessions, only those having ISTEP+ scores for both 2005 and 2006 were included in this analysis)

**CHANGE:** +12.8 (Math) +16.1 (E/LA)

**% SHOWING GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:** 72% (Math) 70% (E/LA)

**% SHOWING 1 YEAR'S GROWTH ON ISTEP+ SCALE SCORE:** 28% (Math) 48% (E/LA)

**% PASSING ISTEP+ (2005):** 67% (Math) 48% (E/LA)

**% PASSING ISTEP+ (2006):** 64% (Math) 48% (E/LA)

## SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

### MATHEMATICS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Sylvan (Marion), 23 matches out of 39 eligible students (59%) were found for Mathematics. For the group who participated in SES, 65% showed growth on ISTEP+, compared to 54% of the non-SES group. 22% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 29% of the students who did not participate. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 9 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 4 points.

MATHEMATICS						
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	23	59%	65%	22%	9	65%
Non-SES	23	59%	54%	29%	4	58%

## ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

Where possible, each student who participated in SES was matched with a similar student who did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2005 ISTEP+ scale score. The chart below provides the results of the match comparison that demonstrates how the ISTEP+ scores and scale score growth of students who participated in SES compare to similar students who did not participate in SES. For Sylvan (Marion), 24 matches out of 40 eligible students (60%) were found for English/Language Arts. For the group who participated in SES, 79% showed any growth on ISTEP+; a higher percentage of the group that did not participate in SES (83%) showed any growth. However, 50% of the students who participated in SES showed one year's growth on ISTEP+, compared to 46% of the students who did not participate in SES. The SES group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 19 points, while the non-participating matched group's average ISTEP+ score grew by 26 points.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS						
Students	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2006)
SES	24	60%	79%	50%	19	50%
Non-SES	24	60%	83%	46%	26	63%

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE:**

**B-**

**OVERALL GRADE: B+**